

It is going to be a cold environment this winter. That is a normal environment then. When elderly people and poor people have to make choices this winter between food and medicine and heat, that is not a very good environment. We will do all we can here to supply them with alternative resources to hold down their heating bills, but there is one remaining fundamental fact about why they must make those choices in this environment. We have lived for 8 years without an energy policy coming from this administration, except one—the tin cup in the hand of Bill Richardson—and a policy that somehow the production of hydrocarbons in our country was environmentally damaging. I think most of us know that is no longer true today.

So I thought as I awoke this morning and felt the cool in the air and turned up the thermostat on the wall, while I may be able to afford my heating bill this winter, I know a good many people won't be able to afford theirs. That is a tragedy in this country that should not have to happen—a country that has always been so wise to allow the marketplace to provide one of the great abundances that we have always had that has set our Nation apart from all others, in our ability to produce and succeed, and that was an abundant supply of energy.

In 8 short years, that abundant supply has dwindled to a point where we really have no surpluses at all today. The average demand for growth in energy goes up 1.4 percent in our country on an annualized basis, and we have only increased production by 0.4 percent in the last 8 years—in all segments of energy. That tells you one thing very clearly. Somebody has failed along the way, and I must tell you, serving on the Energy Committee and studying and examining this issue very thoroughly over the last several years, I know who has failed. It is the Clinton-Gore administration. They failed to recognize the reality of the marketplace, the reality of the world production supply, and disallowing us from producing our way out of it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for my friend from Idaho. We served together in the House, and we have worked together many years on public resources issues dealing with the West. I don't mean to be disagreeable, but on this issue we simply disagree. I am going to take a couple of minutes because I have told the Senators from Ohio and Iowa they can speak next.

The oil problem started in the Republican administration; it certainly wasn't the fault of the Republican administration. There was an embargo by the OPEC nations. Following that, there was an bipartisan effort to

change things. There were incentives to develop oil shale, do alternative energy with wind and solar and geothermal. But with the oil glut that came about, all of that was taken away. Some of the research involving alternative energy was simply not renewed by Congress. That is too bad.

During the years of the Clinton-Gore administration, they have tried very hard every year that I have served on committees and subcommittees with jurisdiction to deal with energy matters. They have tried every year—especially in the appropriations process—to get more money for development of alternative energy sources. They have been stymied every time.

We should also understand that if we could reduce the consumption of fuel in America—for example, if we had more fuel-efficient cars and if we had automobiles that were 3 miles per gallon more efficient, we would save a million barrels of oil a day.

There are things we need to do here. We need to join in a bipartisan effort, not a finger-pointing effort, to develop energy policy in this country. None of us wants to be dependent on foreign oil. In fact, with the oil being so cheap, there was no incentive for us to do it. Congress failed, and it wasn't simply that we didn't meet what the administration wanted. Certainly, this legislation has been suggested by my friend from Idaho, has as its centerpiece oil development in ANWR, the pristine Arctic wilderness, which we are not going to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, last week, we started to debate a tax bill and it had to be brought down because there wasn't consent to move ahead on it. Before we adjourn and go home, hopefully, we will pass a tax bill. But there are a lot of provisions in that bill that are very good; common sense dictates them; and a lot of these are very bipartisan. So the President has threatened to veto the tax bill. I want to bring up some of these issues and ask the President why he would veto something as good as these provisions, where there is bipartisan consensus that we ought to pass them.

Obviously, this bill doesn't contain everything I would like to see in it as a Member of the Senate. As a member of the Finance Committee, we have a chance to be on the ground floor of the drafting of the legislation coming out of that committee. On the other hand, no one person, even a member of the committee, can get everything he wants in the bill. There are even some things in this bill that I don't like, but on balance it will do a lot of good for a lot of people. Therefore, I think it should be enacted.

To begin with, the bill contains a number of provisions I authored or co-

authored with some colleagues and these are the bipartisan provisions that I am thinking about. For instance, on the issue of pensions, I worked very closely with Senator GRAHAM of Florida—several critical pension provisions. As we anticipate the upcoming retirement of the baby boomers, we are always astonished at how much it is going to cost during their retirement. Retirement is expensive, not only due to rising life expectancy but also because inflation and taxes must be factored into the cost of retirement.

We keep insisting that baby boomers—now 10 years away from their retirement—must do more to prepare for that retirement. How can they do that if we don't give them the tools they need? This bill has a lot to do with that because it would make small but significant steps to improve the ability of baby boomers and subsequent generations to prepare for retirement. This bill will increase retirement savings and the national savings rates by allowing workers to save more in their pension plan or in their individual retirement account.

How can the President find disagreement on that point—the necessity of having better pension systems, the necessity for updating the individual retirement accounts so more can be saved in those accounts and so more people can be encouraged to save in those accounts?

Our bill would restore section 415 limits for pension contributions closer to—not all the way, I am sorry to say—where they were before the 1993 tax increase bill was passed.

You remember that 1993 tax increase bill? As Senator MOYNIHAN said on the floor of the Senate, it was the largest tax increase in the history of the world after Bob Dole said it was the largest increase in the history of the country.

That was a pretty significant tax increase in 1993. You remember that it passed on the tie-breaking vote of Vice President GORE as he sat right there in the chair. He cast the tie-breaking vote to pass a tax bill that most all Republicans thought was bad for the country. Even some Democrats thought it was bad for the country. When Republicans were in the minority, it would have still died on a 49-to-49 vote—except for the tie-breaking vote of the Vice President.

This bill will restore some of the bad aspects that the 1993 tax bill had on pensions contributions with these 415 limits. This bill increases existing IRA contribution limits because under this bill Americans would be able to contribute \$5,000 annually. That is an increase up from the current \$2,000 maximum contribution. This IRA limit has not been increased in the 18 years since the last time it was effective.

For workers without a pension, a pretax individual retirement account is one of the best ways they can save for retirement. This limit is being increased for traditional IRAs and Roth IRAs.